

**SUMMARY OF THE
ACCREDITATION PROCESS COMMITTEE MEETING
FEBRUARY 22, 2000**

Participants: Mary Ann Baumgart; Janet Cruse; Maureen Hamilton; Dave Hill; Nick Macelletti; Sheila Meyers; Gleason Wheatley; John Griggs, Chair

Summary:

The primary focus of the conference call was again on existing and proposed language for mobile laboratories. Based on discussions from the previous conference call, revised language for items b), c) and d) in section 4.0 was developed and was distributed to the committee prior to the conference call. The revised language reads as follows:

- b) A mobile laboratory that is not associated with a fixed-base laboratory is considered an environmental laboratory and requires its own accreditation.
- c) An auxiliary mobile laboratory is owned by an accredited fixed-base laboratory, operates under the same quality system as the fixed-base laboratory, and performs a subset of the analyses for which the fixed-base laboratory is accredited. In the case of an auxiliary mobile laboratory that operates exclusively within the state in which the fixed-base is located, the primary accrediting authority shall determine if a separate accreditation is required. A separate accreditation is required for an auxiliary mobile laboratory that operates outside of the state in which the fixed-base laboratory is located.
- d) A mobile laboratory which is associated with a fixed-base laboratory but operates under a different quality system or performs analyses for which the fixed-base laboratory is not accredited requires a separate accreditation.

The proposed language was discussed by the participants of the conference call and there was agreement among the committee members on the content of the language. The conference call participants agreed that item c) should be divided into two parts to more clearly differentiate auxiliary mobile laboratories that operate exclusively within the state in which the parent fixed-base laboratory is located from auxiliary mobile laboratories that operate outside of the state in which the parent fixed-based laboratory is located. The participants also agreed to change the order in the proposed section 4.0 so that items b), c), and d) become d), b) and c) respectively. John Griggs indicated that he would make the agreed upon changes and distribute a revised section 4.0 prior to the next conference call.

Zonetta English, a member of ELAB, joined the conference call to discuss the recommendation from ELAB that the Accreditation Process Committee develop an advisory appendix on the issue of due process for laboratories. Several of the committee members expressed concerns regarding developing an advisory appendix which would not be a standard containing requirements. A

number of committee members also commented on the difficulty in addressing the subject since the laws governing due process differ from state to state. Janet Cruse offered to discuss the issue with lawyers in the State of Illinois Laboratory Accreditation Program and report to the committee. It was decided that the ELAB recommendation would be discussed further during the next conference call. John Griggs indicated that he would send out a selection form to all committee members to schedule the next conference call.